## Case 4:14-cv-00142-PJH Document 15 Filed 04/07/14 Page 1 of 7

1 2 3 4 5 6	EILEEN M. BISSEN, Bar No. 245821 CHLOE QUAIL, State Bar No. 262797 NEYHART, ANDERSON, FLYNN & GROSBO 369 Pine Street, Suite 800 San Francisco, CA 94104 Tel. (415) 677-9440 Fax (415) 677-9445 Email: ebissen@neyhartlaw.com	OLL	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE NORTHERN D	ISTRICT OF	CALIFORNIA
10	(San Francisco Division)		
11	SAN MATEO ELECTRICAL WORKERS	Case No.	14-cv-00142-PJH
12	HEALTH CARE TRUST; INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL	PLAINTIE	FS' CASE MANAGEMENT
13	WORKERS, LOCAL UNION 617; SAN	STATEME	CNT; [P <del>ROPOSED]</del> ORDER
14	MATEO COUNTY ELECTRICAL CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY	CONTINU CONFERE	ING CASE MANAGEMENT CNCE
15	RETIREMENT TRUST; SAN MATEO		
16	COUNTY ELECTRICAL APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING TRUST; Dominic Nolan, as	[Local Rule	16-9]
17	Trustee of the above TRUSTS; and NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS	Date:	April 10, 2014
18	ASSOCIATION, SAN MATEO CHAPTER,		2:00 p.m. 3 - 3rd Floor
19	Plaintiffs,	Location:	1301 Clay Street Oakland, CA 94612
20	VS.	Judge:	Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton
21			
22	MICHAEL BIRKELAND, an individual,		
23	Defendant.		
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

NEYHART, 28 ANDERSON,
FLYNN &
GROSBOLL
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

2

5

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

2627

NEYHART, 28

ANDERSON,
FLYNN &
GROSBOLL
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

#### INTRODUCTION

This is an ERISA collections case. Plaintiffs SAN MATEO ELECTRICAL WORKERS HEALTH CARE TRUST; INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL UNION 617; SAN MATEO COUNTY ELECTRICAL CONSTRUCTION **INDUSTRY MATEO** RETIREMENT TRUST; SAN COUNTY **ELECTRICAL** APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING TRUST; Dominic Nolan, as Trustee of the above TRUSTS; and NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION, SAN MATEO CHAPTER (hereafter "Plaintiffs") allege that Defendant MICHAEL BIRKELAND (hereafter "Defendant") failed to pay fringe benefit contributions due, resulting in liquidated damages and interest, as well as attorneys' fees and costs.

Defendant's deadline to answer the Complaint was on or about March 6, 2014. Defendant failed to file an answer or other responsive pleading on or before March 6, 2014, however. Accordingly, on March 25, 2014, Plaintiffs filed their request for entry of default. (See, Dckt. No. 11.) On March 26, 2014, this Court entered default as to Defendant. (See, Dckt. No. 13.) Plaintiffs therefore respectfully request that the Case Management Conference presently scheduled for April 10, 2014 at 2:00 p.m. before the Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton be continued to a later date to afford Plaintiffs the opportunity to file their Motion for Default Judgment.

- 1. <u>Jurisdiction and Service</u>: This is an ERISA collection action, and as such, this Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §§ 1132 and 1145. Defendant was personally served on February 13, 2014. (See, Dckt. No. 5.)
- 2. <u>Facts:</u> This case concerns the underpayment and nonpayment of mandatory fringe benefit contributions by Defendant to Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs allege Defendant's actions constitute a failure to make contributions to a multi-employer plan, as well as a breach of fiduciary duty,

10

8

15 16

17

18 19

20

2122

23

2425

26

27

NEYHART, 28
ANDERSON,
FLYNN &
GROSBOLL
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

3. <u>Legal Issues</u>: The principal legal issue in this case is whether Defendant is liable for the

unpaid fringe benefit contributions and resulting liquidated damages, interest, attorneys' fees and

costs.

4. <u>Motions</u>: Plaintiffs anticipate filing a Motion for Default Judgment. Plaintiffs are not

aware of any other potential motions at this time.

5. <u>Amendment of Pleadings</u>: Plaintiffs do not anticipate any amendment of pleadings at

this time.

6. Evidence Preservation: As Defendant failed has failed to appear in this case, the parties

have not discussed any necessary steps to preserve relevant evidence.

7. Disclosures: As Defendant failed has failed to appear in this case, the parties have not

exchanged initial disclosures.

pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1145.

8. <u>Discovery</u>: No discovery has been conducted. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f), the

parties' discovery plan, including the Plaintiffs' views and proposals thereon, is as follows:

(a) Plaintiffs do not propose any changes should be made in the timing, form,

or requirement for disclosures under Rule 26(a).

(b) Plaintiffs are unaware at this time of the subjects on which discovery may

be needed. Plaintiffs believe that since the requisite discovery, if any, in this case will be minimal,

discovery should be completed quickly and should not be conducted in phases or be limited to or

focused on particular issues.

(c) Plaintiffs do not foresee any issues about disclosure or discovery of

electronically stored information.

(d) Plaintiffs are unaware at this time of any issues about claims of privilege or

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

26 27

NEYHART, 28
ANDERSON,
FLYNN &
GROSBOLL
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

(e) Plaintiffs do not propose any changes be made in the limitations on

- discovery imposed under these rules or by local rule.
  - 9. Class Actions: This case is not a class action.

of protection as trial-preparation materials.

- 10. <u>Related Cases</u>: A previous case *San Mateo Electrical Workers Health Care Trust, et al. v. F. Connolly Co.*, Case No. 12-cv-6452 SI is arguably related to the present action.
- 11. <u>Relief</u>: Plaintiffs seek money damages for unpaid and underpaid fringe benefit contributions owed pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement, plus liquidated damages, interest, attorneys' fees and costs.
- 12. <u>Settlement and ADR</u>: As Defendant failed has failed to appear in this case, the parties have not agreed to an ADR process.
- 13. <u>Consent to Magistrate Judge For All Purposes</u>: Plaintiffs do not consent to a magistrate judge to conduct further proceedings.
- 14. Other References: Plaintiffs do not believe this case is suitable for reference to binding arbitration, a special master or multi-district litigation.
- 15. <u>Narrowing of Issues</u>: As Defendant failed has failed to appear in this case, there has been no discussion between the parties regarding issues which can be narrowed.
- 16. Expedited Schedule: Plaintiffs do not believe there is a need for this case to proceed on an expedited basis. Plaintiffs expect the case will be resolved via a Motion for Default Judgment.
- 17. <u>Scheduling</u>: As Defendant failed has failed to appear in this case, Plaintiffs believe setting pre-trial dates is premature. Further, Plaintiffs believe the case will be resolved via a Motion for Default Judgment and, as such, there is no need for a pre-trial schedule.

## Case 4:14-cv-00142-PJH Document 15 Filed 04/07/14 Page 5 of 7

1	18. <u>Trial</u> : Plaintiffs believe the case will be resolved via a Motion for Default Judgment			
2	and, as such, trial will not be necessary.			
3	19. <u>Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons</u> : Plaintiffs are not aware of any			
4	other interested entities or persons other than the named parties.			
5	20. Plaintiffs believe that the above statement addresses all matters so as to facilitate the			
6	just, speedy and inexpensive disposition of this matter.			
7	just, speedy and meripensive disposition of this matter.			
8	D ( 1 A 21 A 2014			
9	Dated: April 4, 2014 Respectfully submitted,			
10	NEYHART, ANDERSON, FLYNN & GROSBOLL, A <del>PG</del>			
11				
12	By: Eileen M. Bissen			
13	Attorneys for Plaintiffs			
14				
15				
16				
17				
18 19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

NEYHART, 2 ANDERSON, FLYNN & GROSBOLL ATTORNEYS AT LAW

## Case 4:14-cv-00142-PJH Document 15 Filed 04/07/14 Page 6 of 7

1	[ <del>PROPOSED]</del> ORDER		
2	Having read and considered Plaintiffs' Case Management Conference Statement, and good		
3	cause appearing therefore,		
4	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Case Management Conference currently scheduled for		
5	April 10, 2014 at 2:00 p.m. shall hereby be continued to June 12 , 2014		
6	at $2:00$ a.m. / p.m. The case management conference will be vacated if the motion for defaul		
7	judgment is filed by June 5, 2014.		
8			
10	Dated: April 7, 2014		
11	HONOR IT IS SO ORDERED J. HAMILTON		
12	United State Judge Phyllis J. Hamilton Judge		
13	THEN DISTRICT OF CE		
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
20			
21			
22			
23			
4			
25			
6			
7			
8			

NEYHART, 28 ANDERSON, FLYNN & GROSBOLL ATTORNEYS AT LAW

#### -----

2

I, the undersigned, declare:

4

I am employed in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. My business address is 369 Pine Street, Suite 800, San Francisco, California 94104. On April 4, 2014 I served the within:

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

5

# PLAINTIFFS' CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT; [PROPOSED] ORDER CONTINUING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

7

on the parties in said cause following our business practice, with which I am readily familiar. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid. I placed a true copy of the within document enclosed in a sealed envelope with first class postage thereon fully prepaid for collection and deposit on the date shown below in the United States mail at San Francisco, California addressed as follows:

10

11

12

Michael Birkeland 41 W. Summit Drive Emerald Hills, CA 94062

13

I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on April 4, 2014, at San Francisco, California.

15 16

14

Eileen M. Bissen

Ţ

18

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

NEYHART, 28
ANDERSON,
FLYNN &
GROSBOLL
ATTORNEYS AT LAW